

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

This amendment adds, changes and/or deletes claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claim(s) remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

Claim 1 has been canceled, and claims 2, and 7 have been rewritten in independent form. Additionally, claims 2, 4, 13, 14 and 15 have been amended. The limitation of claim 2 has been added to independent claims 14 and 15 so that they track claim 2, which is now independent. These amendments do not raise any new issues. The limitations of claim 2 were examined in the previous office action.

Selected claims were rejected under 35 USC 112 for lack of antecedent basis for some terms. Appropriate amendments have been made to correct this informality.

Claims 2, 10, 11, and 13 were rejected under 35 USC 103 over Emens in view of Hamzy, and further in view of McGee. This three-way reference rejection is respectfully traversed and reconsideration thereof is requested.

Emens discloses a system for preventing the downloading of an entire searchable repository by replacing a document locator with a unique key that times out after a predetermined period of time. Thus, a re-usable URL cannot be established by the user. Importantly, Emens performs these operations transparently at the server during normal HTTP requests. There is no need in Emens to modify the browsers that communicate with it. In contrast, the present claimed invention is not concerned with preventing the use of a given URL at a later time. Rather the present claimed invention requires that the claimed operations be performed via a programming interface at the browser, i.e., the browser must be modified with this API in order to perform the claimed method. This feature is clarified by the language of now-independent claim 2, which requires that “an imaging extension performs the receiving, translating and mapping steps, and wherein the imaging extension

does not accept a reference from the external web content.” This reversal from the server to the browser is done because the focus is not on the security of a server, but rather is on protecting the resources of a user’s imaging client. Thus, external web content loaded into the browser cannot ever access these resources directly, but can call actual methods in the programming interface. An arbitrary URL will simply not be processed by the browser as the imaging client has now been modified.

Hamzy discloses the use of an intermediate or proxy server to intercept requests to a web server and to insert a print button in the returned document. Hamzy does not make up for the deficiency of Emens.

McGee is cited by the examiner as disclosing the feature of an imaging extension not accepting a reference from web content, citing column 13, lines 7-28. However, the deficiency of Emens is not rectified by McGee. McGee discloses the incorporation of a session manager 320 into a web server 310 to prevent a user accessing the server in an uncontrolled fashion, i.e., McGee discloses a server extension. The point of McGee is to control an Internet server. See column 1, lines 6-8.

Accordingly, claims 2, 7, 11, 14 and 15 and all claims that depend therefrom are allowable for this reason.

Additionally, note that claim 3, which depends from claim independent claim 2, requires that the resource that the external web content desires to access is associated with the user’s personal imaging repository. Thus a dialogue can be set up between the external web content loaded into the browser and the resource. This concept is not shown by the references.

The dependent claims recite various important limitations that make them each allowable in view of those additional limitations.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested, and an early passage to issue solicited.

Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance.
Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a
telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date 2/11/05

By 

Customer Number: 22879

William T. Ellis
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 26,874

Telephone: (202) 672-5485
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399